

SPECIAL MEETING OF BERKELEY COUNTY COUNCIL

Chairman: Mr. James H. Rozier, Jr., Supervisor
Vice Chairman: Mrs. Judith K. Spooner, District No. 2

A **SPECIAL MEETING OF BERKELEY COUNTY COUNCIL** was held on Tuesday, September 24, 2002, in the Assembly Room of the Berkeley County Office Building, 223 North Live Oak Drive, Moncks Corner, South Carolina, at 6:35 p.m.

PRESENT: Mr. James H. Rozier, Jr., Supervisor, Chairman; Mr. Milton Farley, Councilmember District No. 1; Mrs. Judith K. Spooner, Councilmember District No. 2; Mr. William E. Crosby, Councilmember District No. 3; Mr. Charles E. Davis, Councilmember District No. 4; Mrs. Judy C. Mims, Councilmember District No. 6; Mr. Caldwell Pinckney, Jr., Councilmember District No. 7; Mr. Steve C. Davis, Councilmember District No. 8; and Ms. Barbara B. Austin, Clerk to County Council. Mr. Steve M. Vaughn, Councilmember District No. 5, was absent from this Special Meeting of Council.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act, notice of the meeting date, time, place and agenda was posted on the bulletin board at the entrance of the County Office Building and the Berkeley County Library, and mailed to the newspapers, radio stations, television stations and concerned citizens.

Chairman Rozier called the meeting to order; Councilmember Spooner gave the invocation; and Councilmember Crosby led in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

Chairman Rozier stated that on the agenda was an Executive Session to discuss matters relating to the proposed location, expansion, or the provision of services encouraging location or expansion of industries or other businesses in the area served by the county; or the receipt of legal advice where the legal advice relates to a pending, threatened, or potential claim or other matters covered by the attorney-client privilege, settlement of legal claims, or the position of the County in other adversary situations involving the assertion against the County of a claim.

It was moved by Councilmember Crosby and seconded by Councilmember Mims to go into Executive Session for the reason stated. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of Council.

Berkeley County Council went into Executive Session at 6:38 and returned at 8:27 p.m.

Chairman Rozier stated Berkeley County Council went into Executive Session for the reasons stated in the motion; no action was taken formal or otherwise.

Councilmember Crosby asked was it necessary for Legal Counsel to be present in the Executive Session? Chairman Rozier advised that Ms. Wauben's presence in the Executive Session was appropriate.

Chairman Rozier allowed Cindy Forte, Mary Brown and Janet Jurosko to address Council.

Ms. Forte of the Register of Deeds Office addressed Council concerning much-needed upgrades and special salary increases for her employees. She read the letter previously given to Council and dated September 18, 2002, to make it a part of the record.

"ALL MEMBERS BERKELEY COUNTY COUNCIL:

"THIS IS A FOLLOW-UP TO ALL OF OUR PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS, MEETINGS, MISSED MEETINGS, MISCOMMUNICATIONS, IN OTHER WORDS THE ENTIRE LABORED PROCESS THAT HAS BROUGHT US ALMOST AT FULL CIRCLE.

"TO BRIEFLY RECAP THE PROCESS THUS FAR:

"MAY 13, 2002 - PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION AND REQUESTS MADE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION; DID NOT LEAVE INFORMATION WITH COUNCIL, BECAUSE INFORMATION WOULD BE SUBJECT TO A FOIA REQUEST.

"AT THE JULY 22, 2002 - PRESENTED PACKETS TO COUNCIL INCLUDING GENERAL INFORMATION AND UPGRADE AND SALARY INCREASE REQUESTS.

"AUGUST 12, 2002 - ON FINANCE COMMITTEE AGENDA FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION - TO DISCUSS PACKETS PRESENTED ON JULY 22 - ASKED TO DELAY BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR.

"AUGUST 19, 2002 - ON AGENDA - WENT INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION; AGAIN PRESENTED PACKETS CONTAINING UPGRADE AND SALARY INCREASE REQUESTS - ASKED BY COUNCIL TO DELAY UNTIL SEPTEMBER 16, 2002.

"SEPTEMBER 16, 2002 - ON AGENDA - MOTION MADE AND SECONDED THAT NO ACTION WOULD BE TAKEN - WERE TOLD THAT WE COULD SPEAK ONLY TO GIVE INFORMATION - ASKED BY COUNCIL TO DELAY UNTIL TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 24, 2002.

“IN SUMMARY, WE CAME TO YOU FOUR MONTHS AGO DISCREETLY IN EXECUTIVE SESSION WITH WHAT WE FEEL ARE VERY LEGITIMATE CONCERNS. WE GAVE YOU EXAMPLES OF QUESTIONABLE HIRING PROCEDURES; WE GAVE YOU EVIDENCE OF SEVERE DISCREPANCIES IN THE GRADING OF EMPLOYEES THROUGHOUT THE COUNTY; WE OFFERED DOCUMENTATION THAT SUPPORTED OUR REASONING FOR FAILING TO REQUEST NEEDED UPGRADES AND SALARY INCREASES; WE PROVIDED FIGURES THAT SHOWED THAT INCREASES HAVE IN FACT BEEN GIVEN TO EMPLOYEES IN SOME DEPARTMENTS EVEN THOUGH ALL DEPARTMENTS WERE APPARENTLY ASKED NOT TO MAKE REQUESTS. WE FULLY EXPLAINED THAT THESE PRACTICES ALLOWED SOME COUNTY EMPLOYEES TO BENEFIT, BUT THAT THE EMPLOYEES IN OUR OFFICES WERE NOT PROVIDED THAT SAME TREATMENT. WE OFFERED DOCUMENTATION SO THAT YOU MIGHT MAKE INFORMED DECISIONS REGARDING UPGRADE AND SALARY INCREASE REQUESTS THAT WE ALSO BROUGHT TO YOU AT THAT TIME

“FOR THE PAST FOUR MONTHS IN ADDITION TO THE LAST FOUR YEARS, WE HAVE BEEN ASKED TO DELAY OUR REQUESTS FOR THE ADVENT OF THE PROPOSED NEW GRADE SYSTEM. LAST MONTH, WE WERE GIVEN A FIRM DATE OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2002, AT WHICH TIME WE STATED THAT WE WOULD RETURN EXPECTING TO SEE SOMETHING CONCRETE. THAT DATE HAS PASSED, YET STILL WE HAVE NOTHING IN WRITING NOR DO WE HAVE ANY ASSURANCES THAT OUR CONCERNS WILL BE ADDRESSED IN ANY KIND OF TIMELY MANNER.

“IN THIS INCREDIBLY LONG AND FRUSTRATING PROCESS, ALL FOCUS HAS BEEN PLACED ON THE ‘GRADE SYSTEM’ AND OUR REQUESTS HAVE BEEN TOTALLY IGNORED. OUR MAIN INTENT WAS, AND STILL IS, TO MAKE CERTAIN THAT OUR EMPLOYEES ARE FAIRLY COMPENSATED FOR THEIR HARD WORK AND DEDICATION. UNFORTUNATELY, IT SEEMS THAT OUR REQUESTS ARE NOT NEARLY AS IMPORTANT AS FINISHING A STUDY THAT HAS BEEN PROMISED FOR YEARS. PLEASE UNDERSTAND THAT WE FEEL EQUALLY THE NECESSITY FOR A NEW OVERALL GRADE SYSTEM, HOWEVER, IF THE GRADE SYSTEM IS PROPERLY IMPLEMENTED, OUR REQUESTS SHOULD NOT AFFECT THE SYSTEM, AND IT IS ABSOLUTELY UNFAIR TO ASK OUR EMPLOYEES TO CONTINUE TO WAIT WHILE EVERY OTHER EMPLOYEE IN THE COUNTY IS STUDIED.

“WHEN WE FIRST CAME TO YOU IN MAY, WE WERE TOLD THAT YOU WERE ALWAYS AVAILABLE FOR US TO COME TO WITH REQUESTS OF ANY KIND; THAT IF WE COULDN'T GO TO YOU, THEN TO WHOM COULD WE GO. THE REALITY IS THAT WE HAVE BEEN TRYING TO COME BEFORE YOU WITH OUR REQUESTS FOR FOUR MONTHS NOW, OBVIOUSLY TO NO AVAIL. UNFORTUNATELY, THIS PROCESS HAS SPOKEN LOUDER THAN ANY

WORDS. AFTER WAITING FOR (2) HOURS ON SEPTEMBER 16, WE WERE TOLD THAT NO ACTION WAS GOING TO BE TAKEN, AND THAT WE COULD SPEAK FOR INFORMATION ONLY. IT SEEMS THAT PROVIDING THE NECESSARY PAPERWORK TO BE PLACED ON AN AGENDA OFFERS NO GUARANTEE OF BEING HEARD. THE MANNER IN WHICH WE HAVE BEEN TREATED OVER THE PAST FOUR MONTHS SHOWS A TOTAL LACK OF RESPECT, NOT ONLY FOR US AS ELECTED OFFICIALS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS, BUT AS INDIVIDUAL TAXPAYERS OF THIS COUNTY.

OUR FERVENT HOPE IS THAT WE WILL AT LEAST BE HEARD AND THAT OUR REQUESTS WILL BE ADDRESSED IN SOME MANNER ON TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 24, 2002. AT THE VERY LEAST, IF WE CAN GET SOME TYPE OF RESPONSE, WE CAN MOVE FORWARD IN WHATEVER DIRECTION WE FEEL IS APPROPRIATE.

SINCERELY,

S/Janet Brown Jurosko, Berkeley County Auditor
S/Mary Brown, Berkeley County Clerk of Court
S/Cynthia B. Forte, Berkeley County Register of Deeds"

Ms. Forte referenced the packet provided to Council containing a summary of her requests initially presented on July 22 that gave a summary of her upgrade and special salary increase request: 1) Since all of her primary clerical employees, Record's Management Clerk, Record's Management Clerk I, and Record's Management Technicians are fully cross trained and perform identical duties she would like for their titles to be consistent as Record's Management Technicians; 2) Staff Coordinator to be updated to Staff Coordinator/Office Manager since those positions have consistent duties; 3) Receptionist's title changed to Record's Management Receptionist/Clerk; and 4) Initial upgrade and salary request total is \$38,149.90. Ms. Forte stated that figure is itemized on the chart in their packet. Unfortunately, the figure does not include the total cost to the County because they were initially requested on July 31, 2002, and again on August 22, 2002. She requested that Council consider approving the increases with the stipulation that the total figures would be provided to Council as soon as Human Resources gives them to her. If Council approves the increases the salaries would still be low, and she anticipates that the new grade system would handle the additional discrepancies.

Ms. Janet Jurosko, Berkeley County Auditor reviewed the packet initially provided to Council and stated she would answer any questions they may have. She requested that Council take a look at employees' grades and salaries in the Auditor's Office. Additional work had to be assigned to employees to keep up with the demands and changing tax laws. Ms. Jurosko indicated she would always assure that her department provides professional service to all of the taxpayers in the County. However, she has failed her employees by not being able to upgrade their positions and/or salaries when they have added responsibilities. She stated she cross trains and rotates tasks so

that everyone would know what the other does. A customer is never turned away because someone is at lunch, out sick, or off. There are nine (9) employees in her department and she would like to continue to cross train. The total requested is \$23,458.36 for seven (7) employees, which will not affect the grade system.

Councilmember Mims asked, in comparison, how many employees did Dorchester County Auditor's office have? Ms. Jurosko stated Dorchester County has eleven (11).

Ms. Jurosko stated she was a conservative person and have been able to provide the services needed to Berkeley County citizens with the amount of personnel she has; "there is no excess fat in my department."

Ms. Mary Brown, Clerk of Court, stated they had previously provided Council a letter dated May 13, which included the departmental comparison of grade ranges, clerical positions for grades by departments, listing of clerical postings for the past two (2) years with grades, salary range, questionable postings showing upgrades and qualification changes, and special salary increase given to employees.

Ms. Brown stated she had employees at lower grades supervising employees of a higher grade. Her top employee was a Grade 26 but she supervised a Grade 27; another Grade 15 supervised other grades. The requested amount for her upgrades is \$89,089.91, which accommodates 35 employees and is very cost efficient. She stated this request would not interfere with the Grade System; however, the requested figure does not include fringe benefits. Ms. Brown read from a prepared statement. ***(A copy of the statement is attached hereto and by reference is made a part hereof.)***

Councilmember Spooner stated the letter read by Ms. Forte indicated in one of the paragraphs, *"for the past four months in addition to the last four years, they had been asked to delay their request for the advent of the proposed new grade system."* It has not been four years, but since the summer of 1999. Council did not ask Ms. Wauben to work on this grade system but she saw that there was a problem and began to work on the system. She stated that in the early 90s a consultant was asked to come and make a presentation. Mr. Archer, the consultant, made a presentation to Council and the fee for the study was in the range of \$50,000 to \$80,000; and the county did not have the money to do it. A few years later the fee escalated; different man, same company.

Chairman Rozier stated in July 1999, job questionnaires were sent out. In that same month the computer system went down and had to be replaced. It took from July 1999 through July 2001 to implement the new computer system; and no extra personnel were hired to do that. During those two years, a freeze was implemented and he gave Council a listing of the employees that received upgrades and raises. In that time we had literally gone \$6,000,000.00 into the fund balance.

Ms. Forte stated she wanted it to be clear that it had been in the excess of three years that they had been asked to wait for upgrades.

Chairman Rozier indicated that he was not implying that any of their requests was unjustified, but there are many problems throughout the County's system and that is what the Grade System is proposed to correct.

Councilmember Mims stated she could not see where their request and the Grade System coincide.

It was moved by Councilmember Mims and seconded by Councilmember Charles Davis to approve the requests made by Berkeley County ROD Cindy Forte, \$38,149.90; Berkeley County Auditor Janet Jurosko, \$23,458.36 and Berkeley County Clerk of Court Mary Brown, \$89,089.91.

Councilmember Spooner stated the total amount of the requested figures was \$188,000.00, which would include benefits. Chairman Rozier stated that if this were used as an example for the entire County the figure would be approximately \$2.6 million.

Chairman Rozier stated that when that is divided by four (4) and we do the \$188,000.00, or wait until the last three months of the year, at those figures it would take \$667,000.00. As they saw earlier, it would take about \$400,000.00. If you take \$188,000.00 of the \$400,000.00 now, you have spent half of what's needed to do the complete funding.

Councilmember Mims stated Chairman Rozier often expresses his concern for the employees' moral; however, the moral of the employees in the departments being discussed has got to be the "pits."

Chairman Rozier stated that since 1991, the Clerk of Court's office has gone from 16 employees to 34. The salaries have gone from \$330,645.00 to \$1,193,954.00 for a 261.1 percent increase; that's the top in the County; no other department had that kind of increase in salary. "If the moral is the pits there, think about where everybody else is who have gotten less than that."

Ms. Brown stated she did not go back to 1991 but excluding Public Works, EMS, the Sheriff's Department, and the Detention Center, there have been 108 upgrades, which totals over \$300,000.00 in increases.

Chairman Rozier stated there have been 58 salary changes within the last two years for the entire County.

Chairman Rozier stated the Auditor's Office has gone from 7 to 11 employees, and an increase in salary from \$134,933.00 to \$366,902.00 for a 172 percent increase. The employees increased 57 percent while the salaries increased 172 percent.

Chairman Rozier continued, the ROD's Office has gone from 8 to 10 employees for a 25 percent increase and the salaries increased 99.63 percent.

Chairman Rozier stated if they look at total budgets, the number one department in the County is the Sheriff's Department.

Ms. Jurosko asked that he give examples of salaries in other offices compared to their offices. Chairman Rozier stated he didn't have the comparison by salaries but by total budgets; however, he would be happy to get those for them. Ms. Jurosko stated she was losing employees to other departments where they make more money and have fewer responsibilities. Chairman Rozier stated that if Ms. Jurosko were losing people to other departments for fewer responsibilities and more money he needs examples of that. The grade system would solve that problem once it is implemented. He stated he has had many people transfer from one department to another for less money.

Ms. Jurosko stated her employees are so underpaid because she had not been to Council in the last three to four years. She was instructed the grade system would take care of this and was under the impression that no one was getting upgrades or salary increases with the exception of Cost of Living increase. When she found out it was different, she decided to make this request. She stated she was not there because of the grade system but because she has failed her employees as a director of that department by not coming to Council to ask for salary increases when their job responsibilities have increased. Ms. Jurosko stated she picked up a boat last year from one taxpayer in the amount of \$45,000 and was asking less than that for her employees.

Ms. Forte stated that since 1999 not one of her employees has gotten a special salary increase or an upgrade; they received merits and COLAs only. If they were to compare her employees' salary to the other salaries in the County, they would find that they are very low. They have an increased workload and she thinks they deserve better than that. She had been asking them to wait for years and simply cannot ask them to wait any longer.

Councilmember Pinckney asked Ms. Forte how many employees did she have? Ms. Forte stated she has nine employees.

Councilmember Mims asked that there be a Roll Call vote on the requests.

Councilmember Farley asked Ms. Forte, Ms. Jurosko and Ms. Brown if they had reviewed the proposed grade system? They responded that the plan was presented on a board but they didn't know qualifications and salary ranges. Ms. Brown stated she has too many employees to try to remember everyone's name on the chart. Councilmember Farley stated it was a breakdown of positions and not names. He recommended they take time to visit Human Resources and study the grade system. Ms. Jurosko stated she was never given the opportunity to study the grade system.

Ms. Wauben stated she had given everyone several opportunities to come. Two weeks prior she scheduled a drop in time from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. where directors could come without appointments. She also indicated to the directors by e-mail that before they file their objections, come by and look at the board. It did not have salary ranges per Council's directions.

Chairman Rozier stated the grade system is not designed to compare salaries; it is designed to compare responsibilities in levels with other responsibilities.

Ms. Forte stated Council was copied a letter of objection from them. She stated Ms. Wauben has worked very hard on this system and she applauds her efforts. Unfortunately, it's very difficult to look at a board and fully understand where their employees fall. They have to compare to others because they know what their employees do and what their responsibilities are. It would have been nice to have the proposed scale in writing so they could study it and truly give the warranted objections.

Councilmember Crosby indicated that Council probably got the same feeling about the chart at first glance; however, he came in last week and spent three hours with Ms. Wauben. He selected a position and went through in detail as to how the position initiated, how it was graded, and how it was put together; and he understood the system a lot better when he did that. When Council left on September 16, they agreed to have a workshop to get a better understanding of the system. "The system that we are currently working under is so politically loaded, it's unbelievable. Whoever has the political powers of Council could get the salaries up, and that's why we are in the position that we are in." Councilmember Crosby advised Ms. Forte, Ms. Brown, and Ms. Jurosko that if they want to get their employees' salaries on the same level throughout the County we must move forward on a system.

Councilmember Steve Davis asked Ms. Brown, Ms. Forte, and Ms. Jurosko if they wanted the requests granted as a package or did they want an individual decision made to each request?

Councilmember Spooner asked how much money was in the Contingency fund? Chairman Rozier stated that \$550,00.00 was in the Contingency fund for the rest of the year.

Chairman Rozier referenced departments that received raises between 2000/2002, and indicated some of those were in Ms. Brown and Ms. Jurosko's department.

Ms. Brown stated she disagrees because in 1999/2000 when she asked for upgrades for her employees, the Magistrates were upgraded to Grade 18. Some of her employees did go from a Grade 13 to a Grade 15. Clerk of Court is a court of records and the grades aren't as high as the Magistrate Court.

Ms. Forte stated the 108 upgrades previously mentioned dates back to July 1999. She stated they had been told for some time that the Grade System would take care of this and her employees are very far behind. She needs some type of incentive to give them because they have been very loyal. She has four employees that don't make \$20,000 and had been with the County six, eight, and eleven years; "that is ridiculous." Ms. Forte stated she can't continue to ask them to wait.

Councilmember Spooner stated that for the last two years, Chairman Rozier approached Council with a budget and said, "I've cut it all I can" and we are going to need 5 to 7-mill tax increase. County Council said to Supervisor Rozier, "we are not raising taxes, cut it."

Ms. Brown mentioned the Internal Auditor's position that was put in the budget and not funded. When the three of them got their employee last year, the Internal Auditor's position was put in the budget again, but was used for salary upgrades in the Finance Department.

Chairman Rozier stated that is totally wrong. "There is no Internal Auditor's position open or any open positions in the Finance Department."

Councilmember Farley indicated that Council was on the verge of adopting this pay plan and he would encourage them to go into the Human Resources Department and look at it, then decide how it would affect them.

Ms. Brown stated she understood that if they adopted the grade system within three months, there is no funding.

Chairman Rozier stated that if we spend it now, there would be no money for the grade system. It takes more money to do eight months of what they are requesting; it takes half of what it takes to do three months of the entire County.

Ms. Forte asked how long would it take for the Grade System to be implemented, and when will her employees see something?

Chairman Rozier stated that is up to Council, but his recommendation is that it be implemented in April 2003 when there is enough funding to do the entire County. They may have to raise taxes next year.

Councilmember Pinckney stated there is no doubt that there are some discrepancies in our current pay system to County employees, and Council would like to see it done equitably. They think that they are closer than ever before to getting a good system. He stated Chairman Rozier mentioned implementation by April; will the proposed requests be able to wait until then?

Ms. Forte stated she thought April was an awful long time for their employees to continue to wait. She stated she has employees making \$13,000/\$15,000/\$17,000 and some one in another office is making \$20,000/\$22,000/\$25,000, it is too long to wait. Ms. Forte stated she understood and she wants everyone in the County to be fairly compensated but would hope that Council could agree with her that it is her responsibility to work for her people.

Councilmember Pinckney applauded Ms. Forte for her efforts, but stated they have been elected to work with everybody.

Councilmember Crosby stated there has to be a solid system that would make it equal for all employees of Berkeley County in each department. The more he digs into what the County currently has, the more he is amazed at how this County existed for 25 years.

Ms. Forte stated that she along with Ms. Brown and Ms. Jurosko would like for Council to vote on their request as a group.

Chairman Rozier restated the motion, which was to fund the three departments for the amounts requested and leave the other 725 employees out.

Councilmember Steve Davis stated it is undeniable that each of the departments has different functions. He stated his consideration was in reference to cost effectiveness of the \$188,000, and also the proposed Grade System. The Grade System is necessary because it is unfortunate that some department heads are stronger than others in achieving things for their employees. Councilmember Steve Davis stated that a part of his itinerary in running for office was no tax increase, and he is concerned about spending money today that may put them in position of having to raise taxes. This Grade System would lend tremendous perfection to a system that is totally imperfect in reference to salary ranges that currently exist in Berkeley County.

Upon call for the vote, a Roll Call vote was requested and was as follows:

Councilmember Farley	"No"
Councilmember Spooner	"No"
Councilmember Crosby	"No"
Councilmember Charles Davis	"Yes"
Councilmember Mims	"Yes"
Councilmember Pinckney	"Yes"
Councilmember Steve Davis	"Abstain"

The Roll Call vote resulted in a tie with three (3) "No" votes, three (3) "Yes" votes, and one (1) "Abstention."

As a result of the tie votes, Chairman Rozier voted “No” and the motion to fund the request of the Clerk of Court for \$89,089.91; the Auditor for \$23,458.36; and Register of Deeds Department for \$38,149.90 **Failed**.

Main Motion

It was moved by Councilmember Farley and seconded by Councilmember Charles Davis to move forward with the implementation of the Grade System by April 1, 2003 or earlier if possible.

Amendment

It was moved by Councilmember Pinckney and seconded by Councilmember Steve Davis to bring in an outside Consultant that is most cost effective ---(COG).

Councilmember Spooner stated for clarification, although the Grade System is a good process, for objectivity reasons it would be good for someone from outside of the County review the process. She along with Mr. Pinckney, Mr. S. Davis felt it was necessary for an outside person to come in and that Council of Governments (COG) would be adequate. They don't know the employees and could come in and objectively take a look at the system.

Councilmember Charles Davis asked could they stipulate a time frame? Chairman Rozier suggested that the system be evaluated within the next 60 days. This would allow Council to make a decision in December. If it were done in April, the MIS and Human Resources Departments would have the necessary information to input everything into the system.

Upon call for the vote on the **Amendment**, the motion passed by unanimous voice vote of Council.

Amended Motion now becomes the Main Motion.

To move forward with the implementation of the Grade System by April 1, 2003 or earlier if possible and to bring in an outside Consultant that is most cost effective --- (COG).

Upon call for the vote on the **Main Motion**, the motion passed by unanimous voice vote of Council.

It was moved by Councilmember Spooner and seconded by Councilmember Crosby to adjourn. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of Council.

The Meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

S/Barbara B. Austin
Clerk of County Council

October 28, 2002
Date approved

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING OF BERKELEY COUNTY COUNCIL

Chairman: Mr. James H. Rozier, Jr., Supervisor
Vice Chairman: Mrs. Judith K. Spooner, District No. 2

Members: Mr. Milton Farley, District No. 1
Mr. William E. Crosby, District No. 3
Mr. Charles E. Davis, District No. 4
Mr. Steve M. Vaughn, District No. 5
Mrs. Judy C. Mims, District No. 6
Mr. Caldwell Pinckney, Jr., District No. 7
Mr. Steve Davis, District No. 8

There will be a **SPECIAL MEETING** of **BERKELEY COUNTY COUNCIL** on **Tuesday September 24, 2002**, in the Assembly Room, Berkeley County Office Building, 223 N. Live Oak Drive, Moncks Corner, South Carolina, at **6:30 p.m.**

CALL TO ORDER

INVOCATION

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PUBLIC DISCUSSION – Requests to be heard must be made prior to Call to Order and comments must be limited to Agenda items being considered for final action.

EXECUTIVE SESSION to discuss matters relating to the proposed location, expansion, or the provision of services encouraging location or expansion of industries or other businesses in the area served by the county; or the receipt of legal advice where the legal advice relates to a pending, threatened, or potential claim or other matters covered by the attorney-client privilege, settlement of legal claims, or the position of the County in other adversary situations involving the assertion against the County of a claim.

WORKSHOP

A. PRESENTATION OF GRADE SYSTEM.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTS BY COUNCIL

PUBLIC DISCUSSION

September 18, 2002
S/Barbara B. Austin
Clerk of County Council